

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-5, 8-19, and 25-27 are pending, of which claims 1-5, 9, 12-13, 16-18, and 25 have been amended. The amendments to claims 2-5, 9, 12-13, and 17-18 are simply to provide clarification and/or to correct informalities noted by the Applicant, and are not to overcome prior art or any other objections.

Independent claims 1, 16, and 25 are amended as suggested by the Examiner in an effort to advance prosecution, and to place the application in condition for allowance (*Office Action* p.10). Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,998,948 to Sisk et al. (hereinafter, "Sisk") (*Office Action* p.3).

As noted above, independent claims 1 and 25 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner to overcome the references of record and/or to place the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 1 and 25-26 are in condition for allowance and Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

A. Claims 2-5, 8-9, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Sisk in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,980 to Rasmussen (hereinafter, "Rasmussen") (*Office Action* p.3).

B. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Sisk in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,222,717 to Traficant (hereinafter, "Traficant") (*Office Action* p.5).

C. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Sisk in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,520,502 to Smethers (hereinafter, "Smethers") (*Office Action* p.6).

D. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Sisk in view of ordinary skill in the art (*Office Action* p.6).

E. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Sisk in view of Rasmussen, and further in view of Traficant and further in view of Smethers (*Office Action* p.7).

F. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Sisk in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,419,164 to O'Neill (hereinafter, "O'Neill") (*Office Action* p.10).

As noted above, independent claims 1, 16, and 25 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner to overcome the references of record and/or to place the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, all pending claims 1-5, 8-19, and 25-27 are in condition for allowance and Applicant requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

1
2 **Conclusion**

3 Pending claims 1-5, 8-19, and 25-27 are in condition for allowance, and
4 Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the subject application. If any issues
5 remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact
6 the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

7
8 Respectfully Submitted,

9
10 Dated: June 12, 2006

11 By: 

12 David A. Morasch
13 Lee & Hayes, PLLC
14 Reg. No. 42,905
15 (509) 324-9256 x 210
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25